Now the proposition is to go further, and having adopted a principle, to tinker up the basis of representation just to suit localities, and make it popular here and there. If the gentleman from Baltimore county can in any way satisfy me that, under the rule adopted here, his county is entitled to this additional representative, I will vote to open the report. That is the only ground upon which I voted for the amendment giving a member to Kent county, that it was actually entitled, by its population, according to the rule, to have two members. I am not now satisfied of that, so far as regards Baltimore county; and I therefore vote "no."

Mr. DENT said: When I voted for the suspension of this same rule a short time ago, I did so under the impression that I was opening the matter to any amendment that might be offered, not supposing it was confined to the special amendment indicated by the gentleman from Kent. But since it appears that it is necessary to suspend in order to move any and every amendment that requires a special motion, I shall vote against any further suspension, unless it have a general application to other amendments to be offered on the same subject. I vote "no."

Mr. MCCOMAS said: I voted "no" upon the last proposition, because I was opposed to any departure from the principle established in the bill. I shall vote "aye" upon this, because the convention, by a large majority, has concluded to depart from the principle established. I do not see why Kent county should have two delegates for 7,000, and Baltimore county six delegates for 46,000. They are both agricultural districts, under the same circumstances. There may be justifiable grounds for discriminating between the city and the counties, but I see none for discriminating between counties. I vote "aye."

Mr. RIDGELY. As one of the delegates from Baltimore county, I will say a word in reply to the question asked here by the gentleman from Anne Arundel (Mr. Miller,) why Baltimore county refused eight delegates upon the theory of representation suggested by the other side of the house, but went for a proposition which reduced the amount of her delegation, and now asks for an increase of her delegation. I have but a very short answer to make to that, and it is this: *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.*

Now, sir, in relation to the remark of the gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Clarke,) who suggested as a reason why he should discriminate and give an additional member to Kent county and refuse it to Baltimore county, that he had been assured by the declaration of some member of this house that there was a sufficient population in Kent county to bring it within the rules, I ask him as a lawyer, whether, in the course of his professional career, he ever permits himself to be assured by declarations founded upon mere judgment, of any fact?

Mr. CLARKE. As the gentleman has put the question——

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Order; order.

The PRESIDENT. The chair cannot permit discussion.

Mr. RIDGELY. I desire to say that I vote for the proposition now before the house upon this theory—I want to explain my vote—that the strict operation of the rule excluded my county from another delegate, and also excluded Kent; and what is fish for one is flesh for the other.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman appears to be transcending the rule, to state concisely the reasons for his vote. The chair cannot permit discussion at this stage of the case.

Mr. CLARKE. When the vote is over, I hope I shall be permitted to make a personal explanation.

Mr. BELT. I move that the gentleman be permitted ——

The PRESIDENT. It is not in order now.

Mr. RIDGELY voted "aye."

Mr. SCHLEY said: When the question was up before, I voted "no," because I believed this was wrong. I have not changed my opinion in that respect; and therefore I again vote "no."

Mr. THOMAS said: I desire to say in explanation of my vote, that when I cast my vote in favor of Kent county having an additional delegate, I did it in good faith; and I did it with the understanding that it was to be a compromise between those two sections; and that while this convention would give to Kent county her rights, they would not refuse to Baltimore county, the largest county in the State, hers. But, to my utter surprise, I find that gentlemen have gone back from their promises.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman is not in order.

Mr. THOMAS. I am trying to explain my vote; and I am opposed to this more especially as gentlemen of the majority of this house have given to the minority one more delegate, and have refused to give the majority one more delegate that they are entitled to receive. I think it is no more than just and right that Baltimore county should have an additional delegate. She gets but six delegates for 46,000 souls ——

Mr. CLARKE. I call the gentleman to order.

Mr. THOMAS. I am explaining my vote. I say that Baltimore county is more entitled to seven delegates than Kent county to two. I voted for two for Kent county; and I vote for Baltimore county to have an additional delegate as a compromise. I therefore vote "aye."

The rule requiring a three-fifths vote, the motion was rejected.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I ask permission to move to strike out "79" and insert "80."